

REMARKS

In accordance with the above amendments, claims 15, 21 and 42-44 have been amended and claims 1-4, 11, 15, 21, 22, 28-35 and 42-46 remain under consideration in the present application.

The allowance of claims 1-4, 11, 15, 21, 22 and 28-35 is gratefully acknowledged. The amendments to claims 15 and 21 were done solely to clarify the language in those claims, the scope remaining the same and they should remain in condition for allowance.

The previous cancellation of claims 36-41 is believed to render the rejection of these claims moot and is not meant as a disclaimer of any subject matter therein or as an admission that any prior art was a factor in such cancellation.

New claims 42-46 are believed to be within the scope of subject matter previously allowed with the allowance of claims 15, 21 and 22. These claims are further supported by elected Figures 39a, 39b, 40 and particularly, Figure 41. See also specification page 29, line 34-page 30, line 4, for support. Any necessary hinged connector needed to arrive at the angled construction of Figure 41, is shown in the specification and drawings of record. Thus, it is believed that the new claims are well supported in the original materials. Entry and allowance of these claims, together with those previously allowed, is

respectfully requested.

It is noted that the Examiner is objecting to the earlier response (paper dated April 27, 2005) because, according to the Examiner, the applicant has not distinctly pointed out what is believed to render the claims patentable over applied references.

In this regard, it is noted that the only applied references in the previous Office Action were Sorenson et al. U.S. Patent 5,203,126 in view of Kemeny U.S. Patent 4,888,895 against Claims 36-41 which have been canceled. The new claims 42-46 clearly distinguish over any combination of these two references. Please note that independent claim 42 from which claims 43-46 depend specifically require at part (b) a mounting system which includes "a plurality of snap-fit receptors in fixed wall or floor mounting devices" and in element (c) "a plurality of snap-fit connectors configured to connect a plurality of said units together at a desired angle".

Sorenson et al. '126 clearly does not disclose a fixed mounting of any kind. Note that their base comprises a "slidable foot assembly 15". There is no teaching of fixing that slidable member to the floor nor is there any suggestion that such would be an advantage as it clearly appears that their complex structure is specifically designed to stand alone without being fixed to a floor or wall. To this Kemeny '895 (new cited) adds nothing as it reveals only a collapsible "multi-box" unit system

which also is designed to stand alone and which clearly displays a method of construction far different from the claimed unit. Thus, the method of joining the box units in Kemeny, as described in column 5, lines 21-43, does not teach or suggest the convenient easy snap-fit connection arrangement for both mounting and connecting together components which is an important aspect of the present invention.

Given the above amendments, taken together with the remarks herein, it is believed that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance and consideration of this paper and early allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Should any issues remain which the Examiner believes could be resolved by a telephone interview, she is asked to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone at her convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.



C. G. Mersereau
Registration No. 26,205
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
820 International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 339-7461